

תוכן העניינים

	שלמה נאה	'שם משמר' ו'שם שבת': עיון נוסף בפרשת החותמות שהיו
5		במקדש
17	מנחם כהנא	הדרשות במשנה וההלכות במדרש: בחינת זיקות גומלין
77	שמעון פוגל ואורי ארליך	לתולדות נוסחה הקדום של ברכת השכיבנו
	ערן ויזל	דעתם של פרשני המקרא בימי הביניים בשאלת חיבור ספרי
103		המקרא: היבטים מחקריים ומתודולוגיים
	אבירם רביצקי	רב סעדיה גאון ויעקב אלקרקסאני על המבנה הלוגי של המצוות
159		השכליות והשמעיות: לוגיקה וכלאם בוויכוח הקראי—רבני
	אבישי בר־אשר	קבלה ומנהג: תשובות הגאונים ומדרשות ה'קדמונים' בפולמוס
195		המנהגים ב'זוהר' ובסביבתו הספרותית
265		ספרים שנתקבלו במערכת
v		תקצירים באנגלית

רשימת המשתתפים בחוברת

פרופ' אורי ארליך, המחלקה למחשבת ישראל ע"ש גולדשטיין-גורן, אוניברסיטת בן-גוריון בנגב, ת.ד. 653, באר שבע 8410501. דוא"ל: ehrllich@bgu.ac.il – ד"ר אבישי בר-אשר, החוג למחשבת ישראל, האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים, הר הצופים, ירושלים 9190501, עמית בתר-דוקטורט, התכנית ללימודי יהדות, אוניברסיטת פרינסטון, ניו ג'רזי. דוא"ל: avishaiba@gmail.com – ד"ר ערן ויזל, המחלקה למקרא, ארכאולוגיה ומזרח קדום, אוניברסיטת בן-גוריון בנגב, ת"ד 653, באר שבע 8410501. דוא"ל: eviezel@bgu.ac.il – פרופ' מנחם כהנא, החוג לתלמוד, האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים, הר הצופים, ירושלים 9190501. דוא"ל: [kahana@mail.huji.ac.il](mailto:menahem.kahana@mail.huji.ac.il) – פרופ' שלמה נאה, החוגים לתלמוד ולמחשבת ישראל, האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים, הר הצופים, ירושלים 9190501. דוא"ל: shlomo.naeh@mail.huji.ac.il – ד"ר שמעון פוגל, המחלקה למחשבת ישראל ע"ש גולדשטיין-גורן, אוניברסיטת בן-גוריון בנגב, ת.ד. 653, באר שבע 8410501, והמכון לחקר ארץ ישראל ויישובה, יד יצחק בן-צבי, ת.ד. 7660, ירושלים 9107601. דוא"ל: skfogel@gmail.com – ד"ר אבירם רביצקי, המחלקה למורשת ישראל, אוניברסיטת אריאל בשומרון, קריית המדע, אריאל 40700. דוא"ל: aviramr@ariel.ac.il

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Shlomo Naeh	שם משמר and שם שבת: A Further Study of the Temple 'Seals'	5
Menahem Kahana	The Relations between Exegeses in the Mishnah and <i>Halakhot</i> in the Midrash	17
Shimon Fogel and Uri Ehrlich	On the History of the Ancient Version of the 'Hashkivenu' Blessing	77
Eran Viesel	Medieval Bible Commentators on the Question of the Composition of the Bible: Research and Methodological Aspects	103
Aviram Ravitsky	Sa'adya Gaon and Ya'qūb al-Qirqisānī on the Logical Structure of the Rational and Traditional Laws: Logic and Kalām in the Karaite-Rabbanite Controversy	159
Avishai Bar-Asher	<i>Kabbalah</i> and <i>Minhag</i> : Geonic Responsa and the Kabbalist Polemic on <i>Minhagim</i> in the Zohar and Related Texts	195
	<i>Books Received</i>	265
	<i>English Abstracts</i>	v

ENGLISH ABSTRACTS

שם שבת AND שם משמר: A FURTHER STUDY OF THE TEMPLE 'SEALS'

Shlomo Naeh

Following a previous article published in *Tarbiz* three years ago (Shlomo Naeh, 'Tradition and Interpretation in the Mishnah on "Four Seals" and Its Talmud', *Tarbiz* 81 [2013], pp. 5-23), this article reexamines the structure and meaning of the date components of the time clause in formal bills, as they appear in Tosefta Bava Batra 11:2 and in the Jerusalem Talmud (Sheqalim 5:5). This examination shows that the meaning of the phrase 'name of the week (שם שבת)' found in the two sources is probably identical to the expression 'name of the priestly division (שם משמר)' that appears in the Jerusalem Talmud. This understanding eliminates the objection raised by Avi Shveka in a recent issue of *Tarbiz* (Avi Shveka, 'The Date Written on Seal Impressions Used in the Temple', *Tarbiz*, 83 [2015], pp. 495-511) against my interpretation, in the aforementioned article, to the Talmudic passage and the seal impression found in the archaeological excavation in Jerusalem.

THE RELATIONS BETWEEN EXEGESES IN THE MISHNAH AND HALAKHOT IN THE MIDRASH

Menahem Kahana

Tannaitic literature contains two main genres: in the Mishnah, and following it, the Tosefta, the *halakhot* (laws) are arranged topically, while the Tannaitic Midrashim present the manner in which the *halakhot* are derived from the Torah, following the order of the verses. This fundamental redactional principle has many exceptions: at times the Mishnah offers *midrashic* reasons for its *halakhot*, while the Tannaitic Midrashim frequently cite *halakhic* passages.

This article begins with a critical summary of the scholarly views on the relation between the Mishnah and Tannaitic Midrashim and then surveys all the mishnaic exegeses of verses from Exodus through Deuteronomy, and all the *halakhot* in the four extant complete *midrashei ha-halakhah* cited following the phrases 'On the basis of this they said [*mikan amru*]', 'On the basis of this you say [*mikan atah omer*]', and 'On the basis of this R. X would say [*mikan hayah R. ploni omer*]'

The two surveys point to a significant difference between Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael and Sifre on Numbers (both from the school of R. Ishmael) and Sifra and Sifre on Deuteronomy (from the school of R. Akiva). The redactors of the *midrashim* from the school of R. Akiva regarded the Mishnah as the most authoritative *halakhic* source and frequently used it, while

the redactors of the *midrashim* from the school of R. Ishmael did not view it as a major source of authority, and their reliance upon it was relatively infrequent.

A comprehensive examination of the '*mikan ...*' terms and the passages cited in them strengthens the conclusion that both the *midrashim* of the school of R. Ishmael and those from the classical branch of the school of R. Akiva (with the exception of Sifre Zuta on Numbers and on Deuteronomy) made use of the Mishnah of R. Judah ha-Nasi, which had been redacted before them. At the same time, this study shows that the '*mikan ...*' citations in the *midrashei ha-halakhah* were incorporated during the redaction of the *midrashei ha-halakhah* themselves.

Our examination of the '*mikan ...*' passages in the *midrashim* from the school of R. Ishmael revealed traces of a non-extant *mishnaic* composition from the school of R. Ishmael. Evidence of this can be found in that about 20 percent of the citations contain the names of sages clearly identified with the school of R. Ishmael or *halakhot* opposed to the Mishnah of R. Judah ha-Nasi but in agreement with juxtaposed exegeses from the school of R. Ishmael.

ON THE HISTORY OF THE ANCIENT VERSION OF THE 'HASHKIVENU' BLESSING

by Shimon Fogel and Uri Ehrlich

This article discusses the wording of the 'Hashkivenu' (lay us down) blessing, the fourth benediction of the recitation of the Shema in the evening prayers. On the basis of the examination of more than 90 manuscripts from the Cairo Geniza we propose division of versions of the benediction according to branches. Comparison of these branches makes possible the clear identification of two versions of the kernel formulation, which is common to all the variants, both those associated with the Babylonian rite and those associated with the Palestinian rite. The authors suggest that the kernel formulation should be regarded as the ancient basis for the expanded versions, a conjecture that is consistent with the testimony of the Mishnah (Berakhot 1:4), which states that this benediction is 'short'.

MEDIEVAL BIBLE COMMENTATORS ON THE QUESTION OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE BIBLE: RESEARCH AND METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS

Eran Viezel

Academics who study medieval Bible commentary take great interest in the views of the commentators on the question of the composition of the books of the Bible. This interest began with the first study of medieval commentaries during the Haskalah period, and has increased considerably since then, showing the extreme importance attributed to this topic in the academy. However, this interest proves to be disproportionate with respect both to the number and content of the statements made by the commentators. Moreover, many of the

forementioned studies are characterized by basic methodological errors and even suffer from incorrect readings of source material.

The main methodological errors are as follows: (1) Modern scholars do not always take into account the tendency of the commentators to vary their language and use anonymous names to attribute authorship; (2) they ascribe erroneous meanings to verbs which describe literary activity; (3) they do not differentiate between questions of authorship and comments which are devoted to literary characteristics; (4) they make unnecessary connections between non-verbal revelation (i.e. writing that is not divine dictation) and editorial techniques; (5) they assume that the question of authorship of the biblical books is as central to the commentator's concerns as it is to themselves; (6) they do not always consider the essential starting assumptions that distinguish medieval commentary from critical Bible research.

These mistakes are interrelated and complementary, and they convey the tenor of the research and to a large extent, shape it as well.

SA'ADYA GA'ON AND YA'QUB AL-QIRQISĀNĪ ON THE
LOGICAL STRUCTURE OF THE RATIONAL AND TRADITIONAL LAWS:
LOGIC AND KALĀM IN THE KARAITE-RABBANITE CONTROVERSY

Aviram Ravitsky

One of the central topics on which the Karaites and the Rabbanites disagreed is the legitimacy of applying analogy (*qiyās*) in legal issues. Ya'qub al-Qirqisānī and Sa'adya Ga'on, two of the great scholars who participated in this debate dealt with it at length.

This article analyses the application of Aristotelian logic to this Karaite-Rabbanite debate. According to the Karaite, Qirqisānī, in legal matters the cause (*'illah*) is similar to the Middle Term in Aristotelian syllogism.

Qirqisānī alleged that Sa'adya Ga'on accepted the application of analogy to the rational commandments (*'aqliyyāt*) but not to the divine commandments (*sam'iyyāt*) and accuses him of inconsistency. Several modern researchers have followed Qirqisānī in his analysis of Sa'adya's view but failed to explain the reason for his distinction between the rational and the divine precepts in this context.

This paper analyses Sa'adya's position, based on the quotations of Sa'adya in Qirqisānī's *Kitāb al-Anwār wa-al-Marāqib* and on the various writings of Sa'adya. The legal structure of a rational precept, in Sa'adya's position, is similar to that of a general proposition, in which the subject and the predicate are connected by a Middle Term, whereas the logical structure of a divine precept is similar to that of an individual proposition, from which no analogy can be drawn.

The use of logic in the debate between Qirqisānī and Sa'adya can be seen as application of Kalām, the support of a religious position by rational and convincing arguments.

KABBALAH AND MINHAG:
GEONIC RESPONSA AND THE KABBALIST POLEMIC ON *MINHAGIM*
IN THE ZOHAR AND RELATED TEXTS

Avishai Bar-Asher

Interpretations of the commandments and commentaries on the reasons for rituals and customs (*minhagim*) played a significant role in late thirteenth-century Kabbalah. Included in this genre was a series of *halakhic* Responsa attributed spuriously to the Geonim, which was associated by researchers with the name of Moses de León, frequently referred to as the redactor (or perhaps author) of the Zohar. Although this hypothesis was based primarily on scant and flimsy evidence, it has become widely accepted amongst scholars, and no effort to provide further solid proof of it has been made to date.

Through a close study of unassigned texts in manuscript as well as in printed form, the author aims to reconstruct de León's relation to these alleged Geonic Responsa. As discussed in the article, this corpus of writing represents a broader interest in theosophical reasoning for rites and commandments in medieval Kabbalah. The analysis of these unstudied texts reveals a textual stage which, the author proposes, constructs polemical and formative writing on *halakha* and *minhag* along kabbalistic lines.

A more general contribution of this study points to de León's affinity with certain textual units in the Zoharic corpus which offer theosophical reasons for *minhagim*. Substantial parallels in style, language, and discourse disclose a triangular relationship between a group of Zoharic texts, de León's later writings, and the composing of allegedly Geonic Responsa, and they illuminate an early and formative stage in the history of the kabbalistic discussion on rites and customs. Finally, bringing to light the common origin of all these texts may contribute to a better understanding of the way some modes of anonymity functioned more generally in the forming of kabbalistic literature.